

Application No. 10/801,904
Response to 14 December 2005 Non-Final Office Action

REMARKS

1. Claims 1-17 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 3, 5, 13, and 14 are amended. No claims are canceled and no new claims are added.

Claim 3 is amended to more grammatically recite "vertical and horizontal surfaces" in place of "a vertical and horizontal surfaces." Applicant submits that correcting claim 3 to more grammatically recite the foregoing limitation does not narrow the scope thereof.

Claim 5 is amended to provide more positive antecedence to "the second intermediate peripheral portion" by inserting the underlined "intermediate," which is recited verbatim in claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that amending claim 5 to provide more positive antecedence does not narrow the scope thereof.

Claim 13 is amended to depend from claim 12, rather than from claim 11, to thereby provide antecedent basis for inter alia the limitation "upper restraint die," which was recited initially in claim 12, rather than in claim 11.

Claim 14 is amended to recite "an extending portion," in place of "the extending portion," this limitation not being previously recited. The foregoing amendment, by correcting antecedence, does not narrow the scope of claim 14.

None of the amendments to the pending claims adds new matter to this Application.

Applicant believes that the Office Action Summary is incorrect in indicating that claims 1-17 are rejected because the Office Action at page 4 clearly states that "the method and apparatus claims for manufacturing articles per claims 1-17 herein are being allowed."

For reasons stated hereinbelow, reconsideration and withdrawal of any rejection or objections are respectfully requested.

Application No. 10/801,904
Response to 14 December 2005 Non-Final Office Action

Specification

2. The Office Action recited the guidelines for specification format under 37 C.F.R. § 1.77(b) and apparently stated that the instant Application should be revised to follow the suggested format. Applicant respectfully submits that the instant Specification is compliant with the requirements for the specification and notes that the use of "should" in 37 C.F.R. § 1.77(b) imparts a voluntary, not mandatory, response from the Applicant. Thus, Applicant respectfully traverses any rejection or objection in the Office Action with respect to the instant specification and further submits that the instant specification is compliant with all known requirements.

35 U.S.C. § 112

3. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2 as indefinite, the rejection asserting lack of antecedent basis for "the squeezing device" in line 1 of claim 12. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and notes that "a squeezing device" is recited in claim 10, in line 4. Claim 12 indirectly depends from claims 10 through claim 11. Because the limitation "squeezing device" has antecedence in claim 10, Applicant submits that claim 12 is not indefinite and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Allowable/Allowed Claims

4. Applicant appreciatively acknowledges allowance of claims 1-17.


Application No. 10/801,904
Response to 14 December 2005 Non-Final Office Action

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if the Examiner believes it would be useful to advance prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,


Wm. Larry Alexander, Ph.D.
Registration No. 37,269

Customer No. 24113
Patterson, Thuent, Skaar & Christensen, P.A.
4800 IDS Center
80 South 8th Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-2100
Telephone: (612) 349-5757